Indiana University Institutional Review Board (IRB)

# Study Amendment

**Reviewing IRB (please choose one):**  IRB STUDY NUMBER:

Biomedical:  IRB-02  IRB-03  IRB-04  IRB-05 AMENDMENT NUMBER:

Behavioral:  IRB-01  IUB IRB

*Please type only in the gray boxes. To mark a box as checked, double-click the box, select “checked”, and click “OK”.*

## Section I: Investigator Information

**Principal Investigator:**

Name *(Last, First, Middle Initial)***:**

Department:      Phone:       E-Mail:

**Additional Study Contact**:

Name:       Phone:       E-Mail:

Project Title:

Sponsor/Funding Agency:       Sponsor Number.

Sponsor Amendment Number.

## Section II: Study Information

This study is:

Open to enrollment

Closed to enrollment

Number of active subjects:

## Section III: Amendment Description

1. Provide a complete description of the proposed change(s) included in this amendment, including any study documents that will no

longer be used:

**We wish to make several changes to the existing study. First, in addition to using Twitter data from our participants, we would like to add another section where participants can choose to share Facebook data. As in the previous iteration of the study, it will be stated that this is completely optional.**

**Second, in addition to answering questions about their demographics, and group identities, we would like to add more survey items that have been widely used in past studies that get different aspects of people’s self-concept. These include ‘Self Aspects’ (McConnell 2011), which are essentially important domains of a person’s life and the traits they feel they exhibit in those domains, as well as Contingencies of Self-Worth (Crocker 2001) – the extent to which a person’s self-esteem is tied to a certain domain of their life (e.g. academics), and the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS- Watson, 1988), to look at how people rate their general emotional valence.**

**Third, we will add survey questions to look at how people differ in their use of Facebook and Twitter. Specifically we include follow up questions to the surveys components described above that ask participants the extent they express these various aspects of themselves on Twitter vs. Facebook.**

**Fourth, we wish to add an option for participants to identify as ‘independent’ in the section where they are asked their political affiliation, and to answer an additional question about level of political conservatism (standard in many studies of politics- see SSS).**

**Fifth, we would wish to increase the maximum enrollment from 1400 to 3000 to accommodate the use of subjects in this next iteration of the study. In the first iteration, 1392 subjects participated.**

**Last, since we are expanding the scope of the study, we would like to change the title from ‘Group Identities on Twitter’ to ‘Self-Aspects in Social Media’.**

2. State the justification/rationale for this amendment. If risks are being updated, please provide specific justification:

**In the first study, we used a somewhat novel paradigm for studying psychological attributes of social media users. We wanted to start with something specific, so we used one psychological construct—group identity—on one social network platform, Twitter. Initial results were promising. We found that certain group identities, like gender, were easier to infer from a person’s online communications than others, like political affiliation. The general approach of surveying human subjects on psychological attributes and correlating that with data from social media is shaping into a very fruitful direction. Through these amendments, we wish to widen the scope of the study to include Facebook, a far more popular social networking site with a diverse range of data, and psychological constructs other than just group identity. This has high potential to provide interesting results for psychologists. For example, though “self-aspects” have been widely studied in psychology, no one has investigated which particular self-aspects people tend to reveal in social media and the extent to which this might differ for different platforms, like Twitter vs. Facebook. In addition, the inclusion of more psychological survey elements and data from multiple platforms may allow us to make a better case to the community of social media researchers for our methodology and the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration between psychologists and computer scientists in this domain.**

**From an overall procedural perspective, there is little difference between the amended study and the study we have run under this IRB. Subjects answer a series of optional questions about themselves and ~~have the option to~~ authorize us to use their data from social media sites. The new study includes more components and will therefore take longer, but will still take less than an hour to complete. The first iteration of the study ended up only taking an average of about 15 minutes for participants. Since participants sign up for an hour’s worth of credit, it also makes more sense to have them answer more questions on widely used survey items, which as mentioned, could be of great benefit to scientific community when used within our paradigm.**

3. Is the study sponsored?

No.

Yes. Check the appropriate line below and provide with this amendment, as applicable:

A copy of the sponsor’s amendment, if the amendment came from the sponsor.

A copy of your notice to the sponsor of this change, if you initiated the amendment.

A copy of the approved amendment will be sent to the sponsor.

None of the above apply. Please explain:

4. Do the proposed change(s) described in this amendment alter the risk to benefit assessment?

No.

Yes. Please describe how the assessment is altered:

5. Do the proposed change(s) described in this amendment require changes to the informed consent and/or assent document(s) or process?

N/A. Informed consent, written documentation of informed consent, and/or assent has been waived for this study. Skip to Section IV..

No. Skip to Section IV.

Yes. Answer items A and B below.

A. Check the appropriate line below.

The new informed consent and/or assent document(s) are in addition to the current one(s).

The new informed consent and/or assent document(s) replace the current one(s).

If there are multiple consent and/or assent documents for this study, please indicate which consent and/or assent document(s) are to be replaced. Both existing consents are to be replaced.

N/A. Changes are being made to the informed consent process only and informed consent document(s) will not change.

B. Will enrolled subjects be informed of the change(s) described in this amendment?

No. Please explain why not: The subjects who enrolled completed the study and were debriefed. These new elements do not impact them.

Yes. Will enrolled subjects be re-consented and/or re-assented?

Yes.

No. Please explain how enrolled subjects will be notified: For the subjects who have enrolled their participation in the study has ended. These changes won’t affect them.

## Section IV: Co-Investigator Update

This submission does NOT include additions or removals to the Investigators (Protocol Personnel). *Proceed to Section V.*

This submission includes additions or removals to the Investigators.

The following investigators are being **added** tothe Protocol Personnel:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name: Last, First MI** | **Department** | **IU Username and/or Email Address** | **Directly Interacting with Subjects: Yes/No** | **Non-Affiliated with IU:**  **Yes/No** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

The following investigators are being **removed** from the Protocol Personnel and will no longer be participating in this research:

## Section V: Amendment Summary

Amendment includes:

Assent, dated:

Number of assent documents:

Authorization, dated:

Number of authorizations:

Clinical Investigator’s Brochure, dated:

Expedited Research Checklist, dated:

Exempt Research Checklist, dated:

HIPAA &Recruitment Checklist, dated:

Informed Consent, dated:

Number of consent documents:

Investigator List, dated:

Protocol, dated:

Recruitment materials (please list and date):

Request form(s) for vulnerable population(s) (please list and date);

Surveys, questionnaires (please list and date)**:**

Summary Safeguard Statement or HUD Form, dated:

Study Information Sheet

Other (please list and date):

**NOTE: Only documents that are being changed as a result of the amendment should be attached and checked in Section V above.** Listing document dates are optional and only necessary if required by the investigator or sponsor.

**NOTE TO INVESTIGATORS: Study amendments *may not* be instituted until approval from the IRB is given.**

Please indicate the type of amendment you are submitting. Please see the Guidelines for Determining an Amendment Type available on the IU Human Subjects Office website for additional information. **Please note that the IRB makes the final determination with regard to whether or not the amendment is acceptable for expedited review or if it requires review at a convened IRB meeting.**

**Minor Amendment.** Change(s) do not significantly affect the safety of subjects and is acceptable for expedited review per 45 CFR 46.110(b)(2)/21 CFR 56.110(b)(2).

**Major Amendment.** Changes potentially involve increased risks or discomforts or decrease potential benefit. The amendment requires review at a convened IRB meeting.

## Section VI: Investigator Statement of Compliance

By submitting this form, the Principal Investigator assures that all information provided is accurate. He/she assures that procedures performed under this project will be conducted in strict accordance with federal regulations and Indiana University policies and procedures that govern research involving human subjects. He/she acknowledges that he/she has the resources required to conduct research in a way that will protect the rights and welfare of participants, and that he/she will employ sound study design which minimizes risks to subjects. He/she agrees to submit *any* change to the project (e.g. change in principal investigator, research methodology, subject recruitment procedures, etc.) to the Board in the form of an amendment for IRB approval prior to implementation.

## Section VII: IRB Approval

This amendment, including documentation noted above, has been reviewed and approved by the Indiana University IRB as meeting the criteria for IRB approval as outlined in 45 CFR 46.111(a). I agree with the investigator’s assessment above regarding whether the amendment is a minor or major amendment, unless otherwise noted.

Authorized IRB Signature: IRB Approval Date:

Printed Name of IRB Member:

*For IU Human Subjects Office use only.*

Recorded in the Minutes of: